

**REMARKS**

Claim 1 calls for enabling operation of the system by transmitting information related to the credential information to a processor-based system. There is no credential information transmitted from one Bluetooth device to another.

Kotola does not transmit information related to credential information. Plainly, it is improper to simply parse the phrase "to enable operation of the system" out of the claim and to ignore the other limitations.

Thus, the Applicant reiterates that there is no basis in the references given to reason from Flodén or Kotola to arrive at the claimed solution. Therefore, a *prima facie* rejection is not made out because the references only concern themselves with authenticating wireless users, not preventing authorized users from accessing a computer system.

The Examiner responds that this limitation is not set forth in the claim. But what is set forth in the claim is transmitting information related to credential information to said processor-based system to enable operation of that system. Nothing of the sort is described in any of the cited references nor do they describe receiving a wireless signal in a handheld device in response to a request to operate a processor-based system.

They teach no reason to do such a thing because they only involve authentication. There would be no reason to do what is claimed simply to authenticate users. Authenticating users prevents unauthorized users but still provides no reason to receive a wireless signal of a handheld device in response to a request to operate and to transmit information related to credential information to the processor-based system to enable the operation of the system. In other words, there is no reason to remotely transmit the information simply to authenticate the system.

The rejection on page 5, rejecting claim 1 under § 102(b) over Flodén, seems to be inconsistent with the rejection on page 6 rejecting claim 1 under Kotola in view of Flodén.

Moreover, there is no way that Flodén teaches claim 1. From the material in column 8, lines 19-33, it is suggested that something in Flodén is corresponding to requesting operation of a processor-based system. No such limitation is claimed. Moreover, nothing in column 8, lines 19-33 of Flodén have anything to do with receiving a wireless signal in a handheld device in response to a request to operate a processor-based system. There is no receiving any wireless signal in a handheld device and none in response to a request to operate a different processor-based system.

Referring to Fig. 4, a dial-up application 134 is provided from the wireless host and the authentication server. Where is the wireless signal that is received in a handheld device? Where is the wireless signal received in a handheld device in response to a request to operate a processor-based system? Certainly, the authentication server does not constitute a handheld device.

Similarly, it is suggested that accessing credential information in a subscriber information module is supported by column 8, lines 33-37. No subscriber information modules are mentioned anywhere. Instead, there is a reference to a SMS center and SMS message that has nothing to do with a SIM.

Finally, the claim language "transmitting information related to the credential information to a processor-based system to enable operation of the system" is rejected based in column 8, lines 40-44. There is no credential information that is forwarded to a processor-based system to be operated. The password is forwarded to the authentication server but the server is not the one that has received the request to be operated.

Thus, the rejection of claim 1 based on Flodén may be reconsidered.

The rejection of claim 1 based on the combination including Kotola is equally insufficient. There is no receiving a wireless signal in the handheld device in response to a request to operate a processor-based system. All that happens in paragraph 9 in the Kotola application is that the first and second Bluetooth devices communicate with one another. Nowhere are there any requests to operate a processor-based system nor does the Office Action point one out. In the same vein, paragraphs 26 and 27 seem to be unrelated to that material, nor is there any transmitting information related to said credential information to the processor-based system.

The assertion that Kotola teaches this (on the bottom of page 6 of the Office Action) is inconsistent with the next page, first and second sentences, where it is conceded that Kotola fails to disclose accessing credential information whatsoever. If he does not access credential information, how could he possibly transmit information related to such credential information. The cited paragraphs 26 and 27 have nothing to do with the claimed invention.

Nor does anything cited in Flodén teach any credential information. Finally, there is no basis to suggest that there is some reason to combine Kotola with Flodén. The suggestion of the motivation to access credential information in the subscriber information module does not make


sense because neither Flodén nor Kotola have a subscriber information module and even if they did, they do not have any reason to transmit such credential information to a remote processor-based system to enable operation of that system.

Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

5/4/06

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100  
Houston, TX 77024  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation